## Case 2:10-cv-02203-RLH -GWF Document 516 Filed 04/03/12 Page 2 of 3

Transportation. Johnson's "opposition" fails to address the terms and conditions of the proposed sales and, in fact, he only vaguely contests the liquidation of the property at all. In short, Johnson's Opposition does not address the substance of the Receiver's motion. Rather, Johnson seeks to relitigate the Court's preliminary injunction order, and he seems to request a protective order as well. However, neither of these issues are before the Court at this time, and an opposition to the Receiver's motion is not the proper vehicle in which to raise them. In any event, Johnson has previously had an opportunity to address the propriety of the preliminary injunction and the Court rejected his position.

The Court, therefore, grants the Receiver's Omnibus motion. The Court finds that the requirements of notice, a hearing, and the obtaining of three appraisals set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 2001 have been adequately complied with under the circumstances. Strict adherence to these requirements would create an unnecessary financial burden on the Receivership Estate. However, the Court orders that in the future the Receiver needs to obtain three appraisals or provide good cause for failure to do so. Finally, the Court deems notice of this motion to be sufficient under Local Rule 66-5.

16 ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

AO 72 (Rev. 8/82) AO 72 (Rev. 8/82) Accordingly, and for good cause appearing,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Receiver's Motion for Order of Sale (#469) is GRANTED. The Court approves and confirms the Receiver's sale of the following property, pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth in the Receiver's motion (#469): (1) two vehicles, consisting of a 2010 Toyota Tundra, VIN No. 5TFUM5F13AX001154 and a 2009 Subaru Forrester, VIN No. JF2SH63609H748915; (2) coins and precious metals of the Corporate Defendants, as identified in the Receiver's motion; (3) certain parcels of undeveloped land located in Washington County, Utah, as identified in the Right of Way Contract attached to the Receiver's motion; and (4) two other parcels of undeveloped land also located in Washington County, Utah totaling approximately 103.17 acres, as identified in the Receiver's motion.

Dated: April 3, 2012

ROGER L. HUNT

**United States District Judge**